DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 258 CS 204 930

AUTHOR King, Barbara
TITLE Measuring Attitutes toward Writing: The King Construct Scale.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (30th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 5-7, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Tests; *Composition (Literary); High School Students; *Measurement; Measurement Instruments; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Composition Process

ABSTRACT

The King Construct Scale, which measures student attitudes about writing, contains 25 bipolar constructs which reflect four major areas of the writing process: purpose of the writing, source of the writing, audience the writing is for, and mode the writing takes. The scale was developed by collecting the data with Pianko and Rogers' "P & R Elicitation Form" and refining those data in a preliminary study of 25 randomly selected high school students. When the scale was first used in 1978, it surveyed 296 students from eight New Jersey secondary high schools. The results of that survey indicate that high school students prefer original writing to assigned writing, personal choice of topic to assigned topics, and self as audience for what they write. The students also show a preference for graded papers instead of ungraded papers. These results suggest that the King Construct Scale is a successful instrument for obtaining student attitudes toward writing. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED172258

MEASURING ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING:

THE KING CONSTRUCT SCALE

Dr. Barbara King
Douglass/Cook Writing Center
Douglass College
New Brunswick, N.J.

Presented at the College Conference on Composition and Communication, April 7, 1979 ©

Panel: Writing Attitudes and Writer's Block

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara King
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

C S204 230

Recent reports of a decline in student writing have prompted popular and professional questioning of student writing achievement. Most of these reports have focused on performance, but prior to performance there exist attitudes which affect performance.

Attitudes toward writing are an integral part of the composing process, but the fact is they are rarely measured and analyzed. We understand little of how students feel about writing: what their perceptions are of it and what values they place on it.

The majority of work done on measuring attitudes toward writing is fairly recent. Hartig (1966) was one of the first investigators to explore the relationship between attitudes toward writing and writing performance. To measure attitudes, Hartig developed a Likert scale which contained 40 statements about the writing process.

Hyndman (1969) developed two instruments to ascertain attitudes toward writing of tenth grade students of different abilities: tape recorded interviews and a 21 item composition attitude scale. His attitude scale was an adaptation of the semantic differential technique which consisted of bi-polar adjectives.

Lim (1974) investigated the attitudes of teachers toward student writing. Her questionnaire was a form of "The Written Work Set" by Barnes and Shemilt, University of Leeds

Institute of Education. Follow-up classroom visitations and interviews were used in conjunction with this form.

In another study, Bamberg (1976) examined the relationship among composition instruction programs, attitudes toward language and composition achievement. A 31 item Likert scale consisting of typical English classroom activities was administered by Bamberg to successful and remedial writers in college freshman composition classes.

Blake (1976) developed an attitude scale to elicit the attitudes of teachers toward writers and writing. His 40 item Likert scale contained negative and positive statements about skills of writing, varieties of writing and kinds of writers.

In a study of the composing process of college freshmen, Pianko (1977) and Rogers (1977) investigated student attitudes toward writing. They developed the P & R Writing Attitude Form, which consisted of 31 bi-polar constructs pertaining to writing. A five point scale separated the two poles.

Maimon and Nodine (1978) developed a writing attitude scale which elicited faculty attitudes toward writing at a four year college. Their five point scale specifically focused on the role of writing in the classroom.

As part of the New Jersey Writing Project two versions of the Emig Attitude Scale were developed: the Emig Student Attitude Scale and the Emig Teacher Attitude Scale. Both scales were Likert-type five point scales containing state-

ments about preferences for writing, perceptions of writing and processes of writing. These scales were administered to students and teachers who participated in the New Jersey Writing Project in 1977-78 (King, 1979).

The instruments developed for the writing studies cited above were used on a limited basis and need replication. Except for the P & R Writing Attitude Form, all consisted of items presented to the subjects by the investigators. The P & R Writing Attitude Form is the only one which contained items supplied by the subjects themselves. For this reason, this investigator decided to develop a similar scale. Both scales are based upon George Kelly's theory of personal constructs.

A year ago at this Convention, Robert Parker and Sharon Pianko, both of Rutgers University, presented a rationale for applying Kelly's theory of personal constructs to attitudinal research. A brief review of Kelly's theory may be useful in understanding the King Construct Scale.

Basic to an understanding of Kelly's theory of personal constructs is his concept of Man-the-Scientist. Kelly saw people as constantly testing the world in relation to sets of constructs they have formed. People have as an ultimate aim the ability to predict and control their world. Therefore, like scientists, people test their hypotheses--their views of the world.

When a person encounters a new experience, this new information is tested against a model of the world. Each person has a unique representative model of the world which consists of a system of personal constructs.

of a system of personal constructs. A construct, then, is "a representation of the universe, a representation erected by a living creature and then tested against the reality of that universe" (Kelly, 1955, p. 12). When a construct is measured against new information, its predictive quality is being tested. If the new information does not hold up in light of the old, the construct may be altered. The world is not static, therefore, these constructs are being constantly tested and revised.

Another important quality of a construct is that it is a two-ended affair, involving a particular basis for considering likenesses and differences, and at the same time for excluding things as irrelevant to the construct involved. (Bannister and Mair, 1974, p. 25). Constructs permit people to construe how things are alike yet different from others. This bi-polar nature of constructs allows people to differentiate events into groups--to abstract them, to make some sense out of them. (Kelly, 1955, p. 120). Constructs help them to predict, and thus control the world. Because of the bi-polar nature of constructs, when people must change, they are confronted by a series of dichotomous choices--each choice being channelized by a construct. Because constructs are dichotomous, scales can be constructed with gradations along a dimensional line.

Pianko (1977) and Rogers (1977) developed a version of the Kelly Repertory Test which elicits constructs and establishes preferred poles pertaining to writing, the P & R

Elicitation Form. The responses of students to this form were the basis for the P & R Writing Attitude Form. This scale was felt not suitable for use with high school students because the bi-polar constructs were stated in the vocabulary of college freshmen. For this reason a new scale was constructed. The P & R Elicitation Form was used to ascertain what bi-polar constructs were held by high school students. A randomly selected group of 13 high school students responded to the P & R Elicitation Form.

The P & R Elicitation Form includes elements proven to be a significant part of all writing situations and experiences. It identifies eight components: source of stimulation, forms the writing takes, mode the writing is in, audience the writing is for, purpose of the writing, response--what is said or written about the writing, the relation of writing to other language arts and creative arts, and the relation of writing to activities outside of school.

Each of these categories was broken into elements and the triads of these elements were presented to the subject. The subject had to state in what important way two of the elements are similar and yet different from the third, and in what important way the third is different from the other two.

From the responses, the King Construct Scale was developed, based upon the students' own words and the bi-polar constructs elicited.

Although administration of an elicitation form to the subjects would give a more in-depth view of their individual construct systems, it is lengthy and cannot readily be administered to a large population. A scale, on the other hand, can easily be administered to a large population.

The bi-polar constructs elicited by the P & R Elicitation Form numbered 46 (See Appendix B). Bi-polar constructs which were similar to each other were combined and a total of 25 bi-polar constructs were retained for the final version of the King Construct Scale.

This scale was then administered to a group of 25 randomly selected high school students. From this trial, directions were clarified and the final King Construct Scale was developed (See next page).

The King Construct Scale contains 25 bi-polar constructs which reflect four major areas of the writing process: purpose of the writing, source of the writing, audience the writing is for, and mode the writing takes. The subjects are presented with a bi-polar construct and they are asked to indicate which pole they feel is important. If they see no difference between the two, they are asked to check the "No Difference" column. There are five columns ranging from "Very Important" at one pole to "Very Important" at the other. For example, students may choose between fiction and non-fiction. Fiction would be at one pole and non-fiction at the other. Students make an "X" in any one of the five spaces separating the two

KING CONSTRUCT SCALE

The following form is designed to find out how you feel about writing and what is important to you when you write. It is made up of opposite constructs or ideas about writing. Please place an "X" in one of the five spaces on each line. If you feel no difference between the two ideas, please mark an "X" in the middle. If you feel one idea is more important than the other, please mark an "X" on that side. There are no right or wrong answers; there is no value judgment attached to any of them. Remember, this form asks for your reactions about writing.

		VERY IMP.	IMP.	NO DIFF.	IMP.	VERY IMP.	
1.	FICTION	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	NON-FICTION
2.	UNGRADED	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	GRADED
3.	CHOICE	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	NO CHOICE
4.	TALK, DISCUSSION	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	WRITE
5.	OWN FEELINGS	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	SOMEONE ELSE'S FEELINGS
6.	ASSIGNED	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FREE CHOICE
7.	FUN	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	WORK
8.	INFORMAL	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FORMAL
9.	PERSONAL	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	SCHOOL, CLASS
10.	CREATIVE, ORIGINAL	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	UNORIGINAL

		VERY IMP.			IMP.	VERY IMP.	
11.	EDITED	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	ROUGH DRAFT
12.	COPIED	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	ORIGINAL
13.	SELF	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	GRADE
14.	TRUSTING ADULT	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	JUDGMENTAL ADULT
15.	UNKNOWN AUDIENCE	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	KNOWN AUDIENCE
16.	FOR OTHERS	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FOR ONESELF
17.	SPONTANEOUS	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FORMAL
18.	TEST, GRADE	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FREEDOM
19.	IMPERSONAL	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	PERSONAL
20.	GROUP, PEERS	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	SELF, PERSONAL
21.	FREEDOM	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FACTUAL
22.	FOR TEACHER	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	FOR THE GROUP
23.	INFORMATION	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	ENJOYMENT
24.	PROSE	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	POETRY
25.	SELF-DIRECTED	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	_____ :	TEACHER-DIRECTED

poles, depending upon which they feel is most important.

To score each item on the King Construct Scale, a positive or negative value was assigned to the left side of each bi-polar construct (See Appendix C). Of the twenty-five constructs included in the scoring system, fifteen are positive and ten are negative on the left side of the form. No value judgment was associated with the negative and positive signs: they were chosen for purposes of scoring.

The scoring for the constructs was done as follows. If a construct had a negative sign on the left side of the form, it was scored as Very Important = 1, Important = 2, No Difference = 3, Important = 4, and Very Important = 5. If a construct had a positive sign on the left side of the form, the scoring was reversed. The bi-polar constructs were scored in this way according to the method developed by Pianko and Rogers. A score of 1 to 2.49 indicated preference for the negative poles; a 2.5 to 3.49 score indicated that these constructs were not part of the student's repertoire; and a 3.50 to 5 score indicated preference for the positive poles.

Four clusters were established for the Scale. Constructs numbered 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21 and 25 were scored under the source category; constructs 2, 7, 9, 13, 18 and 23 were scored under the purpose category; items 14, 15, 16, 20 and 22 were scored under the audience category; and items 1, 4, 8, 11 and 24 were scored under the mode category. Source is defined as where the writers get their material; purpose is defined as the reasons why people write; audience is defined as for whom they are writing; and mode is defined as the form the writing takes.

The results of two populations are reported here. The first population consisted of 263 students from seven secondary schools throughout New Jersey. They were part of the New Jersey Writing Project's study of the teaching of composition in the schools (King, 1979). The second population was comprised of 33 students from one New Jersey secondary school. The first population was surveyed in the spring of 1978 and the second population was surveyed in the fall of 1978.

Table 1 shows the mean scores by clusters. The frequency distribution for the responses is reported in Appendix D. Appendix E shows the mean scores for each individual item.

An analysis of the four clusters reveals the attitudes of students toward writing: their preferences for source, purpose, audience and mode of writing.

Cluster one, source, had overall mean scores of 3.7 and 3.5. The mean cluster scores of both populations indicate that students showed a preference for personal choice of topic. The results of this cluster also indicate that students preferred original writing assignments.

Concerning purpose, cluster two had overall mean scores of 3.0 and 3.5 The second population indicated a preference for graded as opposed to ungraded papers, but they also chose self over grade as a purpose for writing. The 3.0 mean score for the first population shows that there is no preference indicated for these items. This could mean that the constructs do not exist in the construct system of the students, thus indicating a strong possibility that they never had the experience of these choices in their school experience.

TABLE 1

KING CONSTRUCT SCALE:
CLUSTER MEAN SCORES
BY POPULATION

	First Population	Second Population
Cluster One: Source Items 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 25	3.7	3.5
Cluster Two: Purpose Items 2, 7, 9, 13, 18, 23	3.0	3.5
Cluster Three: Audience Items 14, 15, 16, 20, 22	3.2	3.4
Cluster Four: Mode Items 1, 4, 8, 11, 24	3.1	3.8

Cluster three, audience, had mean scores of 3.2 and 3.4, indicating that students lean toward preferring self over teacher or peers as the audience for whom they write. They also prefer writing for a trusting adult as compared to a judgmental adult. It should be noted, however, that both these mean scores fall between 2.5 and 3.49. Although they indicate a tendency to choose the positive poles on these items, the mean scores suggest that these constructs are not part of most students' repertoire. Again, this may indicate that students have not had many experiences in which they write for an audience other than the teacher.

The final cluster, mode, had mean scores of 3.1 and 3.8, indicating that students lean toward fiction and creative writing rather than formal writing.

It should be noted that three of the mean scores are higher for the second population. There may be two explanations for this: first, the second population is much smaller than the first, and second, the second population consists of students who have had this investigator as a teacher, and this investigator tends to emphasize more activities which fall on the positive poles of the scale.

According to Pianko and Rogers, the "No Difference" column means that the construct is not part of the repertoire of the students. On the frequency distribution in Appendix D this is the neutral column. Constructs 1, 14, 15, 20, 22 and 24 have high "No Difference" responses. There may be two explanations for this. It may be, indeed, that the students have not experienced the choices frequently and

therefore they are not part of their repertoire; or the construct may not be part of the repertoire of the students because they do not understand the terms presented. For item 1, for example, students in secondary schools may not have had much experience writing fiction or they may not be familiar with the term "non-fiction."

The findings from the King Construct Scale are presented in tabular form in Appendixes D and E. For a detailed discussion of the individual constructs on the scale see King's "Two Modes of Analyzing Teacher and Student Attitudes Toward Writing: The Emig Attitude Scale and the King Construct Scale." (1979)

It should be noted that nine constructs had extremely high positive ratings of 4.0 or higher. These constructs are worth noting carefully because they are ones which the students feel are extremely important to them. In contrast, no construct received a mean score of 2.0 or lower.

The constructs worth noting are 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 17. Again, these point strongly to the fact that students prefer original writing, free choice, writing to express their own feelings and work that is their own, not copied.

These results support the findings of Pianko and Rogers, who found that college students prefer choice in topics and creative, original writing assignments over ones which are structured, assigned.

One noticeable difference between the two studies is that the secondary students surveyed in the present study prefer

writing assignments to be graded, whereas freshmen in college in the Pianko and Rogers study prefer ungraded to graded papers. This difference is interesting and may be explained by the fact that most secondary students have not had much experience with ungraded assignments.

In summary, students report preferring original writing to assigned writing, personal choice of topic to assigned topics, and self as audience for what they write. They also show a preference for graded papers as compared to ungraded papers.

Both populations reported here consisted of secondary school students in New Jersey, yet it is fair to assume that they are representative of this age group. They represented both male and female students and came from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds. Many of these students will be entering college soon and will carry with them most of the attitudes expressed here. For this reason, it is important for college as well as secondary teachers of English to note the results of these attitude surveys.

How, then, do these results help us as teachers of secondary and college students? Once teachers are made aware of the underlying attitudes of their students toward writing and the bases for these attitudes, they can begin to examine what role they play in fostering or modifying these attitudes. Teaching strategies should be re-examined in light of the findings of this study. Teachers could allow students time to to talk about their assignments before

beginning to write. Allowing time for peer interaction and formulation of ideas may result in better attitudes toward writing, less writer's block and therefore, better products.

The results of the King Construct Scale provide teachers with student preferences concerning writing. These findings indicate that students prefer self-directed personal writing and free choice of topics. If teachers accept these findings, they could arrange their teaching strategies to incorporate such types of writing and offer students more choice of topics. By permitting students to select their own writing topics, they may take more interest in their assignments and develop more positive attitudes toward writing. This belief is supported by Healy (1972), who found that attitudes toward reading could be changed if students could choose their own reading group and reading materials.

The results of the King Construct Scale suggest that students of writing, as well as reading, prefer to choose their own topics. The reading research suggests that permitting them to do so results in improved reading performance and it can be hypothesized that the same would be true for writing performance.

The results of this scale indicate that it is a successful instrument in obtaining student constructs pertaining to writing. It indicates, also, that the P & R Elicitation

Form can be used to construct an attitude scale for secondary students. These findings are consistent with Kelly's theory of personal constructs. The findings suggest that students are able to identify certain dichotomous constructs and that other members of the student population are able to recognize these constructs and rate themselves on a five-point scale between them.

Once teachers know the constructs which their students have pertaining to writing, they can help them elaborate their construct system and introduce new constructs. As noted in Kelly's sociality corollary, people can alter the constructs of others: "to the extent that one person construes the constructive process of another, he may play a role in a social process involving the other person" (Kelly, 1963, p. 99). A teacher can make students aware that there are other ways of seeing themselves in relation to writing by exposing them to the opposite poles of particular constructs pertaining to writing. It is possible for students to change or abandon constructs which are no longer applicable if they discover that others are more beneficial. For example, teachers may introduce students to the idea of ungraded papers by having students experience peer evaluations. The students can then evaluate this new experience and incorporate it into their construct system.

It should be remembered that attitudes are developed, in part, from past experiences. Students' constructs pertaining to writing are based on how they interpret what has happened to them, what is happening to them and how they anticipate what may happen to them in any writing situation. People alter their attitudes, their constructs, as they experience new situations. Teachers, as noted above, can play a large role in this by exposing students to positive feelings about writing and offering them new experiences.

APPENDIX A

P & R ELICITATION FORM

Directions:

On the following pages, you will find nine categories with a list of terms under each of the categories which elaborate them. Following the list of terms for each category are a number of triads based on three numbers which correspond to terms in the list. For each of the triads, three numbers, answer the question, "In what important way are any two within a group alike and thereby different from the third?" Write your responses in this way: Numbers _____ and _____ are alike in this way _____ and different from the third in this way _____.

Sources of Stimulation

1. Teacher assigned topic
2. Class Discussion
3. Personal experience
4. Textbook topic
5. Teacher assigned reading
6. Personal reading
7. Conversation with peers
8. Conversation with a teacher

1. Numbers 3, 1, 2

2. Numbers 5, 3, 4

3. Numbers 6, 4, 7

4. Numbers 8, 2, 5

5. Numbers 1, 4, 6

6. Numbers 2, 4, 7

7. Numbers 3, 6, 8

8. Numbers 5, 6, 8

Forms the Writing Takes

1. Poetry
2. Short story
3. Novel
4. Autobiography
5. Biography
6. Friendly letter
7. Business letter
8. Book report
9. Expository essay - composition
10. Examination essay
11. Diary
12. Journal
13. Term paper

1. Numbers 4, 1, 2

2. Numbers 4, 3, 7

3. Numbers 12, 9, 5

4. Numbers 10, 1, 8

5. Numbers 13, 10, 3

6. Numbers 11, 8, 6

7. Numbers 5, 7, [illegible]

8. Numbers 12, 13, 6

9. Numbers 11, 9, 2

Mode the Writing is In

1. Test
2. Grade
3. Private communication
4. School magazine
5. Class project
6. Literary magazine
7. Journal
8. General publication
9. Homework

1. Numbers 7, 4, 2

2. Numbers 3, 1, 6

3. Numbers 2, 3, 4

4. Numbers 9, 8, 5

5. Numbers 7, 1, 8

6. Numbers 9, 6, 4

Audience the Writing is For

1. Self
2. Trusted adult
3. Teacher - general relationship
4. Trusted teacher
5. Examiner
6. Peer group
7. Members of a working group within a class
8. Unknown public audience
9. Trusted friend
10. No discernable audience

1. Numbers 6, 3, 7

2. Numbers 9, 5, 1

3. Numbers 2, 1, 3

4. Numbers 9, [illegible] 8

5. Numbers 8, 4, 2

6. Numbers 7, 10, 4

7. Numbers 5, 6, 10

8. Numbers 6, 1, 3

Purpose of the Writing

1. For the teacher
2. For a grade
3. For self-understanding
4. To give information
5. To express your ideas
6. To express your feelings
7. To clarify your thoughts
8. To record experiences
9. To share experiences with others
10. To share your feelings with others
11. To persuade others
12. To advise others
13. To define
14. To instruct others
15. To interpret a piece of literature
16. To elaborate or apply a theory
17. For a class assignment

1. Numbers 5, 1, 9

2. Numbers 14, 3, 11

3. Numbers 17, 2, 7

4. Numbers 2, 1, 3

5. Numbers 8, 11, 12

6. Numbers 4, 1, 10

7. Numbers 6, 2, 13

8. Numbers 7, 13, 9

9. Numbers 5, 6, 15

10. Numbers 15, 1, 16

11. Numbers 12, 2, 8

12. Numbers 10, 3, 4

13. Numbers 7, 13, 16

Response--What is Said or Written About the Writing

1. Letter or number grade
2. Teacher symbols as corrections
3. General comments such as good, fair, poor
4. Suggestions for revision or rewriting
5. Verbal discussion for improvement of paper
6. Check mark
7. No grade
8. No comment
9. Peer evaluation

1. Numbers 4, 1, 6

2. Numbers 7, 2, 9

3. Numbers 5, 3, 2

4. Numbers 5, 1, 8

5. Numbers 4, 2, 6

6. Numbers 9, 1, 3

7. Numbers 8, 2, 5

Approaches to Writing

1. Artist
2. Craftsman
3. Poet
4. Creator
5. Recorder
6. Professional
7. Novice
8. Reporter
9. Copywriter
10. Novelist
11. Editor
12. Sculptor
13. Secretary
14. Scribbler
15. Magician
16. English teacher you liked
17. English teacher you disliked
18. Me

1. Numbers 3, 1, 2

2. Numbers 6, 4, 5

3. Numbers 9, 7, 8

4. Numbers 12, 10, 11

5. Numbers 15, 13, 14

6. Numbers 17, 1, 16

7. Numbers 2, 8, 17

8. Numbers 3, 11, 16

9. Numbers 4, 6, 9

10. Numbers 5, 15, 10

11. Numbers 12, 14, 1

12. Numbers 13, 5, 7

13. Numbers 6, 17, 8

14. Numbers 3, 16, 11

15. Numbers 4, 12, 2

APPENDIX B

ELICITED CONSTRUCTS FOR THE KING CONSTRUCT SCALE

1.	personal	school, class*
2.	personal	impersonal*
3.	freedom of choice	assigned, controlled*
4.	choice	no choice*
5.	free	not free
6.	conversation	no conversation
7.	personally initiated	text initiated
8.	for self	for school*
9.	personal, confidential	impersonal*
10.	personal, private	public*
11.	self	other*
12.	self	test*
13.	own topic	assigned topic
14.	anyone	teacher
15.	general	detailed
16.	self	peers, friends*
17.	reading	talking
18.	independent	group
19.	personal	peer groups*
20.	teacher	peer groups*
21.	known audience	unknown audience*
22.	private	large audience
23.	spontaneous	formal*
24.	non-fiction	fiction*
25.	graded	not graded*
26.	personal	authority
27.	creative	not original*
28.	prose	poetry*
29.	original	copied*
30.	first draft	edit*
31.	original	unoriginal*
32.	acceptance	non-acceptance
33.	keep to self	share with others
34.	own feelings	someone else's*
35.	write	talk, discuss*
36.	freedom of expression	factual*
37.	grade	no grade, no evaluation*
38.	grade	self*
39.	opinion	fact
40.	anyone	adults
41.	fun	work*
42.	know well	don't know well
43.	sentences	non-sentences
44.	discussion	teacher
45.	trusting adult	judgmental adult*
46.	information	enjoyment*

*These constructs appeared three or more times in the sample population and therefore were incorporated into the final King Construct Scale. Some appear alone and others are combined on the final form.

APPENDIX C

SCORING GUIDE FOR THE KING CONSTRUCT SCALE

The following form is designed to find out how you feel about writing and what is important to you when you write. It is made up of opposite constructs or ideas about writing. Please place an "X" in one of the five spaces on each line. If you feel no difference between the two ideas, please mark an "X" in the middle. If you feel one idea is more important than the other, please mark an "X" on that side. There are no right or wrong answers; there is no value judgment attached to any of them. Remember, this form asks for your reactions about writing.

		VERY IMP.		NO DIFF.		VERY IMP.	
+1.	FICTION	5	4	3	2	1	NON-FICTION
+2.	UNGRADED	5	4	3	2	1	GRADED
+3.	CHOICE	5	4	3	2	1	NO CHOICE
+4.	TALK, DISCUSSION	5	4	3	2	1	WRITE
+5.	OWN FEELINGS	5	4	3	2	1	SOMEONE ELSE'S FEELINGS
-6.	ASSIGNED	1	2	3	4	5	FREE CHOICE
+7.	FUN	5	4	3	2	1	WORK
+8.	INFORMAL	5	4	3	2	1	FORMAL
+9.	PERSONAL	5	4	3	2	1	SCHOOL, CLASS
+10.	CREATIVE, ORIGINAL	5	4	3	2	1	UNORIGINAL

		VERY IMP.		IMP.	NO DIFF.	IMP.		VERY IMP.	
-11.	EDITED	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: ROUGH DRAFT
-12.	COPIED	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: ORIGINAL
+13.	SELF	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: GRADE
+14.	TRUSTING ADULT	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: JUDGMENTAL ADULT
+15.	UNKNOWN AUDIENCE	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: KNOWN AUDIENCE
-16.	FOR OTHERS	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: FOR ONESELF
+17.	SPONTANEOUS	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: FORMAL
-18.	TEST, GRADE	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: FREEDOM
-19.	IMPERSONAL	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: PERSONAL
-20.	GROUP, PEERS	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: SELF, PERSONAL
+21.	FREEDOM	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: FACTUAL
-22.	FOR TEACHER	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: FOR THE GROUP
-23.	INFORMATION	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: ENJOYMENT
-24.	PROSE	1	:	2	: 3 :	4	:	5	: POETRY
+25.	SELF-DIRECTED	5	:	4	: 3 :	2	:	1	: TEACHER-DIRECTED

APPENDIX D

KING CONSTRUCT SCALE

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CODED RESPONSES
BY FIRST AND SECOND POPULATION

Item	Construct	1 very negative		2 negative		3 neutral		4 positive		5 very positive		no ans
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st
1	Fiction / Non Fiction	21	2	44	5	101	10	70	6	24	6	3
2	Ungraded / Graded	82	4	85	16	50	9	23	4	21	0	2
3	Choice / No Choice	9	1	9	2	55	4	86	6	101	20	3
4	Talk / Write	16	2	43	3	71	9	67	6	65	16	1
5	Own Feelings / Someone Else's	12	3	14	2	59	10	72	4	105	14	1
6	Assigned / Free Choice	22	2	49	2	62	8	61	7	66	14	3
7	Fun / Work	32	2	26	1	75	5	63	12	67	13	0
8	Informal / Formal	19	0	36	2	91	5	79	13	36	13	2
9	Personal / School	27	3	35	1	90	7	67	11	43	11	1
10	Original / Unoriginal	6	0	12	0	35	4	78	10	130	19	2
11	Edited / Rough Draft	56	5	70	4	73	12	31	6	31	6	2
12	Copied / Original	14	1	23	1	45	6	55	6	122	19	4
13	Self / Grade	27	7	50	8	84	5	53	6	38	7	11
14	Trusting Adult / Judgmental Adult	27	0	34	1	92	15	51	8	57	9	2

APPENDIX D CONTINUED

Item	Construct	1 very negative 1st	1 very negative 2nd	2 negative 1st	2 negative 2nd	3 neutral 1st	3 neutral 2nd	4 positive 1st	4 positive 2nd	5 very positive 1st	5 very positive 2nd	no ans 1st
15	Unknown Audience / Known Audience	41	0	51	4	109	14	31	9	30	6	1
16	For Others / For Oneself	16	4	53	4	95	14	51	3	44	8	14
17	Spontaneous / Formal	10	0	36	0	90	10	78	12	44	11	3
18	Test, Grade / Freedom	41	2	43	3	60	7	64	7	51	14	4
19	Impersonal / Personal	13	4	32	5	98	9	72	7	45	8	3
20	Group, Peers / Self, Personal	18	5	47	10	104	9	57	3	35	6	2
21	Freedom / Factual	11	2	35	1	92	11	69	9	49	10	7
22	For Teacher / For Group	30	5	54	8	110	7	45	6	20	7	4
23	Information / Enjoyment	24	1	29	4	82	6	78	7	47	15	3
24	Prose / Poetry	31	8	62	4	120	12	26	5	19	4	5
25	Self-directed / Teacher-directed	14	2	37	3	84	16	66	7	59	5	3

APPENDIX E

KING CONSTRUCT SCALE:

MEAN SCORES BY POPULATION

Item	Description	Mean Score First Population	Mean Score Second Population
1	Fiction/Non Fiction	2.9	3.4
2	Ungraded/Graded	2.1	2.6
3	Choice/No Choice	4.1	4.1
4	Talk, Discussion/Write	3.4	4.0
5	Own Feelings/Someone Else's	4.3	3.7
6	Assigned/Free Choice	3.3	3.8
7	Fun/Work	3.6	4.0
8	Informal/Formal	3.2	4.1
9	Personal/School, Class	3.3	3.8
10	Creative, Original/Unoriginal	4.0	4.4
11	Edited/Rough Draft	2.8	3.1
12	Copied/Original	4.0	4.2
13	Self/Grade	3.3	3.0
14	Trusting Adult/Judgmental Adult	3.3	4.2
15	Unknown Audience/Known Audience	3.0	3.5
16	For Others/For Oneself	3.3	3.2
17	Spontaneous/Formal	3.3	4.0
18	Test, Grade/Freedom	3.5	3.8
19	Impersonal/Personal	3.1	3.0

APPENDIX E (Cont.)

Item	Description	Mean Score First Population	Mean Score Second Population
20	Group, Peers/Self, Personal	3.2	2.8
21	Freedom/Factual	3.4	3.7
22	For Teacher/For the Group	3.1	3.1
23	Information/Enjoyment	3.4	3.9
24	Prose/Poetry	2.9	2.8
25	Self-directed/Teacher-directed	3.5	3.3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bannister, D., ed. Perspectives on Personal Construct Theory. London: Academic Press, 1970.

Bannister, D. and Mair, J.M.M. The Evaluation of Personal Constructs. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bannister, D. and Salmon, Phillida. "Education in the Light of Personal Construct Theory." Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (Summer 1974): 25-38.

Blake, Robert W. "Assessing English and Language Arts Teachers' Attitudes Toward Writers and Writing." The English Record, vol. 24 (Summer/Autumn 1976) pp. 87-97.

Hartig, Hugo. "A Study of the Relation Between Certain Attitudes Toward Major Composition Tasks and Expository Writing Proficiency of College Freshmen." Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1966.

Healy, Ann Kirkland. "Changing Children's Attitudes Toward Reading." Elementary English 40 (March 1963): 255-259.

Hyndman, Roger. "Some Factors Related to the Writing Performance of Tenth-Grade Students." Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1969.

Kelly, George A. "A Brief Introduction to Personal Construct Theory." In Perspectives in Personal Construct Theory, p. 1. Edited by D. Bannister. London: Academic Press, 1970.

_____. A Theory of Personality. New York: W.W.Norton & Co., Inc., 1963.

_____. The Psychology of Personal Constructs, Vol. Two, Clinical Diagnosis and Psychotherapy. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1955.

King, Barbara. "Two Modes of Analyzing Teacher and Student Attitudes Toward Writing: The Emig Attitude Scale and the King Construct Scale." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1979.

Lim, Constance. "Analyses of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Students' Writing." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1974.

Maimon, Elaine P. and Nodine, Barbara F. "Measuring Behavior and Attitude in the Teaching of Writing Among Faculties in Various Disciplines." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, New York City, 28 December 1978.

Pianko, S. with Rogers, L."The composing acts of college freshman writers: A description." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977.

Rogers, L. with Pianko, S. "The composing acts of college freshman writers: A description with two case studies." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977.